



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

certain amount of idealism, no doubt, yet free from all the trappings of divinity. . . .

Lucian's True History is representative of a type which has been popular in all ages—the romantic adventure. The literary progenitor of the type is Homer, particularly in that part of the Odyssey in which Odysseus is represented as descending to the underworld. This type is of a two-fold nature: the one aims to delight through the sheer incredibility of the tale, the other uses the narrative merely as an instrument of satire. To the first division belongs that part of the Odyssey already mentioned, as well as many of the Greek romances of the Alexandrian and Byzantine periods. Here also belong a large number of medieval French romances and the modern scientific extravaganzas of Jules Verne and H. G. Wells. To the second and much more important division, the satirical, belong a host of works which have been of the utmost importance in the history of literature. Here one must place Lucian's True History and the Golden Ass of Apuleius; here also Rabelais' Gargantua and Pantagruel. Don Quixote, which strove by satire to put an end to the romances of chivalry, finds a place in this group, as also Gulliver's Travels. Voltaire's Candide, which held up to ridicule the optimism of Leibnitz, and Samuel Butler's Erewhon and Erewhon Revisited, with their ridicule of Mrs. Grundy and the Church of England, must both be included in this type. By the very nature of comedy, which consists partly in hyperbole, and by the very nature of satire, which strives to destroy a thing by making it ridiculous, the romantic adventure has been frequently employed as an instrument of reform.

. . . The knowledge of the history of a work of art illuminates it, and makes it more beautiful and more precious to the individual, just as . . . with one's native country a knowledge of its history, of its struggles toward perfection, of its successes and failures makes it all the richer and more full of meaning. The appreciation of art is, of course, subjective, as one will readily admit if one considers the difference in effect of some supremely beautiful thing on a Francis Thompson and on a Fiji Islander. If this is so, it is obvious that the wider and deeper the experience of a man—and what is reading but a shortcut to experience?—the greater will be his appreciation of a given work of art. The historical or comparative method, then, not only is of value in itself but it reacts upon and increases the esthetic enjoyment which, after all, is the main thing in art.

C. K.

### MODERN GREEK AS AN AID TO THE TEACHER OF ANCIENT GREEK<sup>1</sup>

Philhellenism in the United States was subjected in November, 1920, to a serious shock in the defeat at the polls of Eleutherios Venizelos and the Greek Liberal Party. The great leader's achievements during the decade then just closing had foreshadowed a period of political and social reconstruction in Greece, and a revival in art and literature, that might once again, in the ardent life of this small but vigorous

nation, have challenged the Western world to new and loftier ideals of liberty and culture. For Venizelos is a progressive revolutionary who sympathizes deeply with all that is sound and sane in the whole range of human endeavor. He has already committed himself to a definite program of reform in legislation dealing with land tenure, the rights of labor, and popular education, a program which is bound, when once adopted, to give Hellenic individualism a new incentive to effort. His advanced views on education, and in particular his attitude toward the Greek language question will be referred to again in the course of my paper. Whatever may be the final outcome of the present Hellenic imbroglio, the seed already sown is destined, so at least a lover of Greece and her language believes, to come sooner or later to full fruition. Meanwhile, we can only wait.

It may be accepted as axiomatic that whatever facilitates taking in the thought of a foreign language directly, without the intervention of translation into English, is helpful in the acquisition of that language. Thought seeks expression in speech, and speech is usually provocative of thought in the speaker himself and in those who listen, much as an inductive wire charged with an electric current superinduces a current in neighboring and parallel wires. Speech development in peoples as well as in individuals keeps even pace with intellectual progress. In fact, thought could never have taken linguistically written form had it not first been expressed in uttered speech. In other words, language presupposes a *lingua*; the English tongue could not have arisen elsewhere than on the tongues of English men and English women. This palpable fact finds convincing illustration in the difficulty experienced when an effort is made to teach the deaf mute to use language (that is, actual words, whether expressed by the fingers, or written on paper), instead of that which is rather malappropriately called the *sign-language*.

A most interesting and suggestive paper was recently read, at a meeting of The New York Classical Club, by Professor George L. Hendrickson, of Yale University, which went far toward proving that to the Greeks and the Romans 'reading' always meant what we should call reading aloud; that they had scarcely developed at all the faculty of reading to themselves, silently. It was apparently easier for them to take in the thought of what they were reading if they formed the words orally and heard them with their own ears. I was particularly interested in this paper, for it seems to me to furnish powerful support for certain theses in linguistic study that have always appealed to me as a teacher. The first of these is that time expended in reading a passage of Greek or Latin aloud, whether in the recitation-room, or in the learner's own study, is never time thrown away, particularly if the student has been trained to this habit from the very beginning of his studies, or can compel himself, even later in his course, to think, as he utters them, what the words mean. We shall thus be doing, though not in Rome, as the Romans did. The second thesis is that this habit of reading

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Hunter College, April 22, 1921. The paper in no way aims to be a treatise on Modern Greek. It should rather be regarded as a protest against the idea that language is to be acquired by thumbing grammar, lexicon, and text-book. I believe that in studying the Ancient languages, exactly as in studying the Modern, appeal must be made to the ear, that practice must be furnished by the tongue, and that the study of Modern Greek is an interesting way of applying these principles.

aloud must have carried with it in the case of the ancients, and therefore must and can carry with it in the case of us moderns, the iron-bound principle that any and every word in the sentence must be explicable by what precedes it rather than by what follows, that is, that the sentence must deliver its message verbatim et seriatim in the order of the Latin or the Greek, as it does in the case of French, English, or German. Nothing will to such a high degree compel to this as reading aloud in the original, unless it be that which, I believe, forms the third postulate of sensible linguistic pedagogy, cultivating in one's self and in one's pupils the ability to take in the thought of an ancient author through the ear alone. Many years ago I remember getting one of my students who had appealed to me for financial aid to read several books of Herodotus to me aloud, with the result that I have ever since taken a peculiar pleasure in reading my Herodotus. It has long since been noted that nearly all Greek literature—the greater Greek literature at any rate—was written to this very end, to be heard, not seen. I have sometimes thought that for students of language the invention of printing was not an unadulterated blessing. In the days before the making of many books, dictation furnished students with their texts and formed a considerable part of their linguistic training. Ear, hand, eye, and probably the tongue too, were used in unison, requiring and therefore developing active and alert minds that could not afford, without penalty, to lapse or wander even for an instant. We must see to it that what should furnish wings to our flight does not become a crutch to our undoing.

Since language is so largely a matter of pure convention, there being no intrinsic reason why a chair should be called a chair and not a shay, it follows that, when we are studying that series of conventions that sprang up and formed the Greek language, it will be of considerable value in impressing on our minds these word-signs, these logograms, to have them used repeatedly in immediate juxtaposition with things and thoughts that are so modern and familiar to us that we do not have to think of their bookish printed English equivalents. The tongue will thus be trained instinctively, almost intuitively, to form the word as the act or the thought occurs. We all know how difficult it is, when Simon says 'Thumbs up', to turn them down, and how nearly impossible it is, in response to the question, 'What is a spiral staircase?', to keep the hand from accompanying the definition with a corresponding movement. Words grow up in groups; they become acquainted with one another; they adapt themselves to one another; they follow one another as sheep follow their leader. Birds of a feather, they flock together; they run in pairs; you never see John without seeing Jenny; the carpenter always builds—a house; a horse just naturally—runs; a man—thinks. All this is what we are driving at when we talk nowadays of thought-units, when, in training our students to read Greek or Latin aloud, we tell them to phrase their words, and urge them, in their study of gram-

matical rules, to memorize idioms and to couple given propositions with concrete examples. We rarely forget such words as become second nature to us, such words as come spontaneously into our minds in connection with given objects or actions.

I surmise that one of the reasons why the Greeks and Romans did their reading aloud was in order to aid themselves in deciphering their obscure and difficult script, through hearing and listening to what I call word-groups; the mind, guided by the tongue, was led along the familiar paths and by-ways of speech, with one word borrowing another, to misuse a common Scotch expression. I have often noticed that, in unravelling some ignorantly scrawled Greek handwriting, instead of poring over the individual letters it is better to forge ahead, reading out aloud, at the risk of misreading here and there, in order that the general drift of the language and the thought may carry me along, so that, almost in spite of what I see, or think I see, I may feel the sentiment and thus grasp the *sententia* of this man who, after all, feels pretty much as I do about almost everything. It may be that, just because of the illegibility of ancient writing, the eye could not outstrip the voice, whereas the clearness of modern typography, permitting the eye to pass over the page so much more rapidly than the voice can follow, has habituated us moderns to read silently, economizing our time and our strength.

This brings me to a consideration of what I regard as one of the greatest advantages to be derived from the study of Modern Greek, the training of eye, voice, and ear in carrying a series of words in the mind and the memory. Although we may be able to compel ourselves to do this in connection with Ancient Greek, it is certainly true that where the subject-matter lends itself easily to question and answer, to conversation and discourse, about common things, this faculty can be more easily and naturally cultivated. The study of Italian has frequently been advocated before conventions of classical teachers for this and other reasons, but a particularly strong case may be made out for Greek. Italian, with its non-periodic sentence-structure and its paucity of inflectional endings, is of comparatively little help in enabling one to carry along the intricate sentences of a Caesar or a Tacitus. On the other hand, owing to the fact that Greek never had, even in classical times, so involved an order as Latin, Modern Greek, as it has developed, has not been compelled to depart so far from the ancient norm, and at the same time its richness in verb-forms and noun-forms, which renders it the most highly inflected of living Indo-European languages, is of considerable value in accustoming the student to *feel* the significance and the force of these various terminations, rather than to reason them out, or piece them together by that Chinese puzzle method—the cut-up-picture method—which we observe our students, frequently, alas! our most patient students, attempting to apply. Who of us has not been non-plussed to find students, in a fourth or fifth year of Latin, confusing plain subject and object, and this in spite of the fact that very few, if any, of the thousands

of sentences read by them have lacked one or the other of these constructions. We know what 'me likee bow-wow' means even before we hear the words 'she likee chow-chow', because the natural order in English is subject, verb, and then object, but how shall we get our pupils to *feel* that, if this first clause were Latin or Greek, it could only mean 'The dog likes me'? Modern Greek would, I think, help a great deal in this direction.

The practical utility of the study of Modern Greek as an aid to the mastery of Ancient Greek will admittedly be in almost exact ratio to the degree of resemblance between what we are tempted to call the 'two languages', but which might better be called two phases of the one indivisible Greek language. For the sake of definiteness in my treatment of the question, I must assume, though this is not exactly true, that Modern Greek is—shall I say?—Choctaw to you, that the language used by Greek bootblacks or peanut vendors is in your ears little more than gibberish. Our much vaunted Erasmian, or so-called ancient, pronunciation of Greek is partly to blame for the misconception that Modern Greek is entirely different from Ancient, though the foolish habit that we have fallen into of learning languages chiefly through the eye, without at the same time training the ear, is to be regarded as an even more serious cause of this marked inability to connect sound with sense.

In what particulars does the Modern Greek pronunciation differ from the Erasmian, as the latter is taught in our Schools? Not to enter into too great detail, the change which most completely disguises a vast number of words is the breaking down of the middle mutes, beta, gamma, and delta, into the corresponding spirants, V, Y (or GH), and TH (as in the English word *them*), except in those cases in which a preceding nasal has preserved the ancient sound. Thus, a Greek of to-day says *ἔβαλε*, instead of *ἔβαλε*, although he still says *κολυμβῶ*; he says *GHάλα*, alongside of *ἔγγονος*, and *Yέφουρα*, alongside of *ἐγγύς*; he says *THεὸλος* at the same time that he says *δνDρα*. The change is in the same direction as that more familiar transformation of *φ*, an aspirate P (as in the English *uphill*), into F, of *χ* (as in *cook-house*) into CH (as in the Scotch *loch* or the German *lachen*), and *θ* (as in *pothook*) into TH (as in *think*). In close connection with the fact that a preceding nasal preserves the ancient sound of beta, delta, and gamma, it is to be observed that, in the combinations *μπ*, *γκ*, and *ντ*, the smooth mutes pi, kappa, and tau in these groups are made sonant by the preceding nasals, so that *ἐμπροσθεν* becomes *ἐμβροσθεν*, *ἀγκαλιάζω* becomes *ἀνΓαλιάζω*, and *ἐντός* becomes *ἐνDός*. Thus, apart from the few cases where ancient beta, gamma, and delta have been preserved by a preceding nasal, these letters as anciently sounded have disappeared, to reappear in many places where pi, kappa, and tau were anciently pronounced. Owing to this modern pronunciation of beta, gamma, and delta, it becomes necessary, in order to transliterate foreign words like *Broadway*, *Glasgow*, and *Detroit* to create

monstrosities like *Μπρόντουαϊ*, *Γλάζγκω*, and *Ντηρδύτ*.

Another phenomenon, with which classical scholars are perhaps more familiar, is the fact that *η*, *ι*, and *υ*, as well as the diphthongs *ει*, *οι*, *υι*, and *ηι* (the last through the prevalence of the latter vowel of the diphthong) are all pronounced alike, as *i* in *machine*. This is the so-called iotacism or itacism of palaeographers and text-critics.

The last peculiarity of which I shall speak is the fact that *υ* in the diphthongs *αυ* and *ευ* has become consonant F or V—F before the surds pi, kappa, tau, and the aspirates phi, chi, theta, V before sonants and vowels. Thus, *αὐτός* is pronounced *άFτός*, and *εὐαγγέλιον* is pronounced *έVαγγέλιον*.

Although these changes are phonetically quite simple and natural, and are comparable to similar phenomena in Italian or Spanish, they *do* result in giving the Greek language a decidedly different sound from that with which we are familiar here in America. It is, however, quite possible, in spite of these differences, or perhaps, rather, because of them, to keep the two pronunciations, in practice, distinct, until perchance the time when all the world will accept the modern pronunciation. There can be no doubt that these discrepancies between Greek as spoken to-day and our more or less theoretical reconstruction of the ancient pronunciation form the great obstacle to arousing an interest in the modern language among our teachers and our scholars.

Apart from the question of pronunciation, what is the actual relation between Ancient Greek and Modern Greek? Whatever may be the reason for the phenomenon, it is an admitted fact that in vocabulary, in the preservation of the inflectional endings of noun, pronoun, adjective, and verb, in its approximation to the Ancient Greek order of words in phrases, clauses, and sentences, and in the plastic nature of the language itself, Modern Greek is closer to Ancient Greek than is any other Modern Language to an ancient predecessor of even a few centuries.

It would be futile to deny that the lapse of the centuries has produced tremendous changes, that the language has become to a high degree analytic, that compound verb-forms, built up by the use of auxiliaries, have crowded out many of the ancient synthetic forms (a tendency that had begun as early as the time of Herodotus), and that these auxiliary verbs have been the death of many of the ancient subjunctive usages and of all optative constructions (it will be recalled that the optative even in New Testament Greek plays a most unimportant rôle). The ancient distinction, however, between present and aorist in the subordinate moods, subjunctive and imperative in particular, is still most exactly and nicely preserved (the present is used of an habitual act, the aorist of a particular occurrence). This is only one of countless indications that the Greek language has never ceased to be written and spoken, and that its life has been continuous throughout the ages.

I should be accused by any one who knows anything at all about Modern Greek of a most serious omission

if I did not make some reference to the much discussed question of Modern Greek diglossy. The *Καθαρεύουσα*, or puristic form of Modern Greek, is the literary form of the language, and has as many levels or strata as there are degrees of familiarity with ancient Greek. The *Δημοτική*, or vulgar language (the vernacular) has a very uniform syntactical and morphological system, though vocabulary and in some measure pronunciation vary so considerably as to create what may be called different dialects. These are, however, in my opinion, never so marked as to create barriers such as to make Greek unintelligible to Greeks. The close connection of the puristic language to Ancient Greek is due to the unbroken tradition of School and Church throughout the ages, an artificially established norm having been steadily preserved, while in the case of the vernacular the unity of common roots, words, idioms, etc., is due to the miraculous preservation of Greek blood, culture, and institutions, through the vitality of the Greek race. It is a thousand pities that, at the time of the establishment of the Greek Kingdom, less than a century ago, concessions were not made to the popular language with its greater simplicity of grammar and forms, for a battle royal in its defence has been waged for decades by those wiser scholars and philologues who realize that a language, like a poet, *nascitur, non fit*. Mr. Venizelos has thrown his influence most wholeheartedly in favor of spending less time on the puristic language in the early grades of the Schools, to the end that instruction may be given in the home language of the boys and the girls. He is a firm believer in putting text-books, cyclopedias, and printed books generally into simple, straightforward, easily comprehended forms<sup>2</sup>.

Changes in the external form of many nouns and verbs are, of course, particularly noticeable in this colloquial form of the language. For example, *μάτι*, 'an eye', is abbreviated at both ends from the ancient *ὀμμάτιον*, by the cutting off of the root syllable and the suffix, so that only the verbal suffix *μα* and the diminutive ending *τι* are left. *λέων*, 'a lion', is first strengthened by the addition of a suffix *απος*, which makes the word mean 'a great big lion', and is then turned into a more colloquial diminutive, which, like *μάτι*, loses its last syllable. A series of phonetic changes which have already been touched upon in kind, in what I have said about the Modern pronunciation, have brought with them many transformations which are, when fully understood, only superficial, but seem decidedly puzzling to the beginner in his first dealings with the vernacular. Thus *κόπτω* becomes *κόβω*; *ἐμβάλω* is pronounced *BENO* (here the ancient beta is kept after mu, and so there is necessary, in the popular, phonetic, writing of the language, a spelling *μπαίνω*). These laws must, of course, be systematically studied in some scientific Grammar like that of A. Thumb, *Handbuch Der*

Neugriechischen Volkssprache<sup>2</sup>, Strassburg, 1910), or of Pernot. The former book has appeared in a very timely English translation by S. Angus (Edinburgh, 1912)<sup>3</sup>. So similar is even this *vernacular* form of the language to Ancient Greek that a course of twenty lessons would give the learner all the essential facts, putting him in position to go rapidly on in his reading or colloquial practice of the language, and leaving only one great obstacle, the acquirement of a vocabulary. As far as the literary form of the language is concerned, if a person has sufficient vocabulary in Ancient Greek to read easily Herodotus, or Lucian, or Sophocles, or even Homer, a short course of five lessons which shall cover some twenty to thirty matters of small detail about the commonest phenomena of the language will enable the average American Grecist within a very short time to read any Modern Greek author with thrice the facility with which he can read any ancient author, however simple, Plutarch, Polybius, Arrian, and Xenophon included.

Convinced as I am that, after one has become conversant with Greek or Latin forms, and has had two or three years of familiarity with syntactical usages, the main difficulty for him is instant appreciation of what foreign words mean, if possible without rendition into English, I firmly believe that the repeated impact of ancient roots in connection with acts, thoughts, and sentiments which are thoroughly modern and can therefore be spontaneously felt, will serve to increase the student's vocabulary very rapidly, giving him a confident control over the language which will make him want to read and read and read in both Modern and Ancient Greek.

COLLEGE OF THE  
CITY OF NEW YORK

CARROLL N. BROWN

## REVIEWS

The Metamorphoses Ascribed to Lucius of Patrae: Its Content, Nature, and Authorship. By Ben Perry. A Princeton University Dissertation. Lancaster, Pa.: The New Era Printing Co. (1920). Pp.74.

The literary triangle formed by the Greek Metamorphoses attributed to Lucius of Patrae, the Latin Metamorphoses of Apuleius, and the *Asinus* ascribed to Lucian was once a seething topic among philologists. Since the studies of Bürger and Rothstein the discussion has simmered down to the apparently reasonable conclusion that the Lucianic *Asinus* is an epitome of the first two books of Lucius's Greek work, and that Apuleius followed mainly the same two books of Lucius, but freely interpolated other material, some of it from other Greek sources. Mr. Perry's dissertation does not essentially change these general conclusions, but, reviving an almost forgotten view of Pauly, contends that Photius was wrong in ascribing the Greek Metamorphoses to Lucius of Patrae, who is not the author, but simply the hero of

<sup>2</sup> Compare some remarks by Dr. A. E. Phourides, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14, 102, at the close of his review of Gregorios Xenopoulos's novel 'The War 1912-1913'.

<sup>3</sup> For a summary of part of this book by Professor C. D. Buck see *Classical Philology* 9.85-96.